

FILED

2013 SEP 13 PM 3:30

CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF.
RIVERSIDE

BY: *[Signature]*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PACIFICO PARTNERS 3 LLC, } Case No. CV 13-6407-UA (DUTYx)
Plaintiff, }
vs. } ORDER SUMMARILY REMANDING
SOHEIL MANAVI, et al., } IMPROPERLY-REMOVED ACTION
Defendants. }

The Court will remand this unlawful detainer action to state court
summarily because defendant removed it improperly.

On August 30, 2013, defendant Soheil Manavi, having been sued in what
appears to be a routine unlawful detainer action in California Superior Court,
lodged a Notice of Removal of that action to this Court, and also presented an
application to proceed in forma pauperis. The Court has denied the latter
application under separate cover because the action was not properly removed. To
prevent the action from remaining in jurisdictional limbo, the Court issues this
Order to remand the action to state court.

Simply stated, plaintiff could not have brought this action in federal court in
the first place, in that defendant does not competently allege facts supplying either

1 diversity or federal question jurisdiction, and therefore removal is improper. 28
2 U.S.C. § 1441(a); *see Exxon Mobil Corp v. Allapattah Svcs., Inc.*, 545 U.S. 546,
3 563, 125 S. Ct. 2611, 162 L. Ed. 2d 502 (2005). Here, defendant has asserted both
4 federal question and diversity jurisdiction as his basis for removal. But as
5 described in more detail in the Order Denying Defendant's Request to Proceed
6 Without Prepayment of Filing Fee, because the unlawful detainer action to be
7 removed does not actually raise any federal claim, and because the amount in
8 controversy does not exceed \$75,000, there is no basis to assert either federal
9 question or diversity jurisdiction. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332, 1441.

10 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that: (1) this matter be REMANDED to the
11 Superior Court of California, Los Angeles County, Santa Monica Courthouse,
12 1725 Main Street, Santa Monica, CA 90401, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction
13 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c); (2) that the Clerk send a certified copy of this
14 Order to the state court; and (3) that the Clerk serve copies of this Order on the
15 parties.

16
17
18 DATED: 8/11/13 
19 HONORABLE GEORGE H. KING
20 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28